arXiv:1602.02347v2 [math.RT] 4 Apr 2016

LINEAR RECURRENCE RELATIONS IN Q-SYSTEMS VIA LATTICE POINTS IN POLYHEDRA

CHUL-HEE LEE

Abstract. We prove that the sequence of the characters of the Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules associated to a node of the Dynkin diagram of a complex simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ satisfies a linear recurrence relation except some cases in types E_7 and E_8. To this end we use the Q-system and the existing lattice point summation formula for the decomposition of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules, known as domino removal rules when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of classical type. As an application, we show how to reduce some unproven lattice point summation formulas in exceptional types to finite problems in linear algebra and also give a new proof of them in type G_2, which is the only completely proven case when the Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules have an irreducible summand with multiplicity greater than 1.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex simple Lie algebra. The decomposition of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules over $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{g}})$ or their tensor products into sums of the irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules is given by the fermionic formula, originally conjectured in [15]. It was obtained by transferring insight from the Bethe ansatz in mathematical physics to representation theory and is interpreted as the combinatorial completeness of the Bethe ansatz.

The strategy of proving the fermionic formula suggested in Theorem 8.1 of [11] consists mainly of three steps. The first is to show that the family $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{a\in I, m\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ of the characters of the Kirillov-Reshtikhin modules $\operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)}$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules satisfies a certain set of difference equations called the Q-system [12, 22]. Here I denotes the set of nodes of the Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}$. The next step is to establish asymptotics of the ratio $\frac{Q_{m+1}^{(a)}}{Q_m^{(a)}}$ as m goes to infinity [12]. The last one is to prove the "$M = N$ conjecture" [7]. These works combined altogether give a proof of the Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture on the fermionic formula.

The formula expresses the multiplicity of an irreducible summand in a certain combinatorial way. In spite of its elegance, it quickly becomes impractical as the rank of $\mathfrak{g}$ increases due to its complicated combinatorial nature. Although there is an algorithm which makes this formula more efficient [16], it is still advantageous to have a more explicit description of the decomposition of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules for practical purposes. In [11, 16], such an alternative formula was conjecturally given for most of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules even when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of exceptional type. In [4] a proof of it was obtained when the multiplicity of each irreducible summand inside $\operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)}$ is always 1. This type of formula has been traditionally known as

Date: February 2016, last modified on April 5, 2016.
This work was supported by the Australian Research Council.

rules for removals of dominos from a rectangle when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of classical type; see, for example, Section 13.7 of [17]. In this paper we shall call it a *lattice point summation formula* as the highest weights of the irreducible summands with non-zero multiplicity can be characterized as lattice points in a suitable rational polyhedron; see Section 2.3.

The asymptotic behaviour of the sequence $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ for fixed $a \in I$ is closely related to the existence of conjectural linear recurrence relations satisfied by it. Although linear recurrence relations in solutions of Q-systems seem to be quite natural to consider in view of the importance of its asymptotics, the treatment of the topic in the general setting has not been given until quite recently. They have been studied in special cases in several different contexts. For example, those relations in type A are considered in [8] from the viewpoint of integrable systems. They are also studied in [21] for type A and D, motivated from a problem in number theory. In [3] a gauge theoretic discussion on the topic appeared. In [20] we gave some general conjectures on the form of these relations which have arisen from experiments and proved them in some special cases by using the known results on difference L-operators for q-character solutions of T-systems [18]. We also add that linear recurrence relations in a certain family of polynomials are studied in [1] and some of these results could be used to handle our problem in type A if one uses the known relationship between Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules and affine Demazure modules [9, 10].

The main theme of this paper is to show that the following two topics mentioned above are very closely related:

(i) linear recurrence relation satisfied by the sequence $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ of the characters of the Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules for $a \in I$
(ii) lattice point summation formula for the decomposition of the Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules associated to $a \in I$

We will first show that that the sequence $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies a linear recurrence relation for all $a \in I$ except some cases in type E_7 and E_8; see Theorem 1.1 for the precise statement. In Section 2, we give a review of background results including the fermionic formula and lattice point summation formulas. In Section 3, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1. The central idea is that the existing lattice point summation formula for $a \in I$ gives a linear recurrence relation in $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$. Once this is done, we can also show such relation for a different node in the Dynkin diagram by employing the Q-system.

In Section 4, to give an application of Theorem 1.1 we turn our focus to conjectural lattice point summation formulas when $\operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)}$ has an irreducible summand with multiplicity greater than 1. The main idea is that once a linear recurrence relation for $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ is established, it is sometimes possible to reduce problems about it to problems in linear algebra. As an illustration of this, we give a proof of some unproven lattice point summation formulas up to a finite amount of computation, which might be carried out using computer algebra systems; see Theorem 4.5. The formula in type G_2 is so far the only example for which we have a proof [5] when there is an irreducible summand occurring multiple times and we also give a new proof of this using our method; see Theorem 4.2.

Notations. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex simple Lie algebra of rank r with a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$. Let $I = \{1, \cdots, r\}$ be the set of nodes of its Dynkin diagram and $\{\alpha_a\}_{a\in I}$ be the set of simple roots. We will use the same ordering for I as in [20].

Let $t_a = (\theta,\theta)/(\alpha_a,\alpha_a) \in \{1,2,3\}$ for each $a \in I$, where θ is the highest root and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ obtained from the Killing form, normalized by $(\theta,\theta) = 2$. Note that $t_a = 1$ if α_a is a long root. Let $C = (C_{ab})_{a,b\in I}$ be the Cartan matrix where $C_{ab} = (\alpha_a^\vee, \alpha_b)$ and $\alpha_a^\vee = \frac{2}{(\alpha_a,\alpha_a)}\alpha_a$. We denote the fundamental weights by ω_a for each $a \in I$ and put $\omega_0 = 0$ for convenience. Let $Q = \oplus_{a\in I}\mathbb{Z}\alpha_a$ be the root lattice, $P = \oplus_{a\in I}\mathbb{Z}\omega_a$ the weight lattice and $P^+ = \oplus_{a\in I}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\omega_a$ be the set of dominant integral weights. Let $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}} := \mathbb{R}\otimes P$. For $\lambda,\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$, $\lambda \geq \mu$ or $\lambda \succeq \mu$ means $\lambda - \mu$ is in $\oplus_{a\in I}\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\alpha_a$ or $\oplus_{a\in I}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_a$, respectively.

We denote the Weyl group by W, which is generated by the set of simple reflections $\{s_a\}_{a\in I}$ on $\mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$. Here each α_a is orthogonal to the reflecting hyperplane of s_a. For $w \in W$, we denote its length, the minimum number of simple reflections to express w, by $\ell(w)$. For any element $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$, there exist $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $\lambda \geq 0$ and $w(\lambda) = \mu$; such λ exists uniquely. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*_{\mathbb{R}}$, we define $\mathcal{O}(\lambda) = \{w(\lambda) | w \in W\}$ and $\mathcal{O}_e(\lambda) = \{e^\mu | \mu \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda)\}$. Note that a W-invariant finite subset Λ of P can be decomposed into a disjoint union of distinct W-orbits, say, $\Lambda = \coprod_{j\in J}\mathcal{O}(\lambda_j)$ with $\lambda_j \in P^+$. The size of $\mathcal{O}(\lambda), \lambda \in P^+$ can be easily computed as its isotropy subgroup is a standard parabolic subgroup, i.e., a subgroup generated by a subset of $\{s_a\}_{a\in I}$; see, for example, Theorem 1.12 in [14].

We put $y_a = e^{\omega_a}$ and denote the ring of Laurent polynomials in $\{y_a\}_{a\in I}$ by $\mathbb{Z}[P]$. As W preserves P, it acts on $\mathbb{Z}[P]$ simply as $w(e^\lambda) := e^{w(\lambda)}$. In this paper we frequently work in the field $\mathbb{C}(y_1, \cdots, y_r)$. Note that the action of W on $\mathbb{Z}[P]$ can be extended to this field and then each $w \in W$ is a field automorphism.

For a representation V of $\mathfrak{g}$, we will denote its character by $\chi(V) \in \mathbb{Z}[P]$, which is an element of $\mathbb{Z}[P]^W$ and the set of its weights by $\Omega(V)$. An irreducible finite-dimensional representation of highest weight $\lambda \in P^+$ will be denoted by $L(\lambda)$.

Let $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ be not a root of unity. As the theory of finite-dimensional representations for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ stays the same as that for $\mathfrak{g}$, we shall use the same notation as above for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

Now let us introduce the basic terminology for linear recurrence relations. Let F be a field and $\overline{F}$ its algebraic closure. A *sequence* $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ in F is a function $a : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \to F$ whose value at n is a_n. The *shift operator* Δ acts on the space of sequences so that for a given sequence $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$, the sequence $\{(\Delta a)_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ is given by

$$(\Delta a)_n := \begin{cases} a_{n-1}, & \text{if } n \geq 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } n = 0. \end{cases}$$

For simplicity of notation, we will also use $\Delta[a_n] := (\Delta a)_n$. Given a polynomial $L(t) \in F[t]$ with $L(0) = 1$, we call $\mathcal{L} := L(\Delta)$ a *difference operator*. We define the *order* of $\mathcal{L}$ to be the degree of L and call $\alpha \in \overline{F}^\times$ a *root* of $\mathcal{L}$ if $L(\alpha^{-1}) = 0$. If $L(t) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^\ell c_k t^k$, then we have $\mathcal{L}[a_n] = a_n + \sum_{k=1}^\ell c_k a_{n-k}$ for $n \geq \ell$. When

$$\mathcal{L}[a_n] = 0, \forall n \geq N \tag{1.1}$$

holds for some $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we say $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ satisfies a *linear recurrence relation of order ℓ with constant coefficients*. When (1.1) holds and N in (1.1) can be taken to be ℓ, we will simply write $\mathcal{L}[a_n] = 0$.

Statement of the main theorem. For each $a \in I$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and $u \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, there exists a finite-dimensional irreducible $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$-module $W_m^{(a)}(u)$ called the Kirillov-Reshetikhin module; see [11, 12] for more detailed discussion. By restriction we obtain a finite-dimensional $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module res $W_m^{(a)}(u)$. As its dependence on u disappears as $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module, we can simply write it as res $W_m^{(a)}$. Let $Q_m^{(a)} = \chi(\operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)})$ for each $a \in I$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. For fixed $a \in I$, we obtain a sequence $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple Lie algebra. Assume that $a \in I$ belongs to one of the following cases :*

- *$a \in I$ arbitrary when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of classical type or type E_6, F_4 or G_2,*
- *$a \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7\}$ when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type E_7,*
- *$a \in \{1, 2, 6, 7\}$ when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type E_8.*

Then there exist finite subsets Λ_a and Λ'_a of P with the following properties :

(i) $\mathcal{L}_a[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$ *where*

$$\mathcal{L}_a = \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda_a} (1 - e^\lambda \Delta) \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda'_a} (1 - e^\lambda \Delta^{t_a}).$$

(ii) Λ_a *and* Λ'_a *are W-invariant.*
(iii) $\mathcal{L}_a$ *is without multiple roots, i.e.,* $t_a\Lambda_a \cap \Lambda'_a = \emptyset$, *where* $t_a\Lambda_a = \{t_a\lambda | \lambda \in \Lambda_a\}$.
(iv) $\omega_a \in \Lambda_a$.
(v) For each $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$, $\omega_a \geq \lambda$.
(vi) For each $\lambda \in \Lambda'_a$, $t_a\omega_a \geq \lambda$.

We can take Λ_a and Λ'_a as given in Appendix B.

Remark 1.2. Let us write

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\ell_a} C_k^{(a)} \Delta^k = \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda_a} (1 - e^\lambda \Delta) \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda'_a} (1 - e^\lambda \Delta^{t_a})$$

where $\ell_a = |\Lambda_a| + t_a|\Lambda'_a|$. As Λ_a and Λ'_a are W-invariant, we have $C_k^{(a)} \in \mathbb{Z}[P]^W$ for each $k = 0, \cdots, \ell_a$. In particular, we get $C_{\ell_a}^{(a)} = (-1)^{|\Lambda_a|+|\Lambda'_a|}$ as Λ_a and Λ'_a are disjoint unions of W-orbits : for any W-orbit $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in P^+$ we have $\sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda)} \mu = 0$ as it is W-invariant and 0 is the only W-invariant element in P.

The conditions (iv),(v),(vi) are related to

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{Q_{m+1}^{(a)}}{Q_m^{(a)}} = e^{\omega_a} \tag{1.2}$$

when the characters are evaluated at suitable elements of $\mathfrak{h}$ or $\mathfrak{h}^*$. This is the asymptotic behaviour mentioned as one of the crucial steps in the proof of the fermionic formula.

2. Background

2.1. **Basic properties of linear recurrence relations.** Let F be a field and $\overline{F}$ its algebraic closure. Assume that $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a sequence in F. Let us first state two standard results on linear recurrence relations without proofs.

Proposition 2.1. *If the generating function of $\{a_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ is a rational function*

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t^n = \frac{b_0 + b_1 t + \cdots + b_N t^N}{1 + c_1 t + \cdots + c_\ell t^\ell}$$

with $b_N \neq 0$ and $c_\ell \neq 0$, then $\mathcal{L}[a_n] = 0$ for any $n \geq \max(N+1, \ell)$, where $\mathcal{L} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} c_k \Delta^k$. The converse also holds.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a difference operator without multiple roots and A the set of its roots. If $\mathcal{L}[a_n] = 0$, then there exists $d_\alpha \in \overline{F}$ for each $\alpha \in A$ such that $a_n = \sum_{\alpha \in A} d_\alpha \alpha^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The converse also holds.*

In this paper we often consider a sequence $\{a'_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ defined by

$$a'_n := a_n^2 - a_{n+1} a_{n-1}. \tag{2.1}$$

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a difference operator without multiple roots and A the set of its roots. Let $\{a'_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be given as (2.1) and $A' = \{\alpha\beta | \alpha, \beta \in A\}$. If $\mathcal{L}[a_n] = 0$, then we have $\mathcal{L}'[a'_n] = 0$ where $\mathcal{L}' = \prod_{\gamma \in A'} (1 - \gamma t)$.*

Proof. We can simply expand $a'_n = a_n^2 - a_{n+1}a_{n-1}$ with $a_n = \sum_{\alpha \in A} d_\alpha \alpha^n$ to get $a'_n = \sum_{\gamma \in A'} d'_\gamma \gamma^n$, where d_α and d'_γ are some elements of $\overline{F}$. □

2.2. **Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules and the fermionic formula.** It is known that the family $\left(Q_m^{(a)}\right)_{a \in I, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ satisfies the following system of difference equations

$$(Q_m^{(a)})^2 = Q_{m+1}^{(a)} Q_{m-1}^{(a)} + \prod_{b : C_{ab} \neq 0} \prod_{k=0}^{-C_{ab}-1} Q_{\left\lfloor \frac{C_{ba} m - k}{C_{ab}} \right\rfloor}^{(b)} \quad a \in I, m \geq 1 \tag{2.2}$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the floor function. We call (2.2) the Q-system of type $\mathfrak{g}$. This was first introduced in [15] and proved in [12, 22] as mentioned earlier in Introduction.

Let $\left(\nu_j^{(a)}\right)_{a \in I, j \geq 1}$ be a family of non-negative integers such that $\nu_j^{(a)}$'s are non-zero only for finitely many (a, j). Let

$$W = \bigotimes_{a \in I} \bigotimes_{j \geq 1} \left(\operatorname{res} W_j^{(a)}\right)^{\otimes \nu_j^{(a)}} \tag{2.3}$$

be a tensor product of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules. For $\lambda \in P^+$ we define

$$M(W, \lambda) = \sum_{\mathbf{m}} \prod_{a \in I, i \geq 1} \binom{p_i^{(a)}(\mathbf{m}) + m_i^{(a)}}{m_i^{(a)}}$$

where

$$p_i^{(a)}(\mathbf{m}) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \nu_j^{(a)} \min(i, j) - \sum_{b \in I} (\alpha_a, \alpha_b) \sum_{k \geq 1} \min(t_b i, t_a k) m_k^{(b)}$$

and the sum $\sum_{\mathbf{m}}$ in the RHS of (2.3) is taken over all $\mathbf{m} = (m_i^{(a)})_{a \in I, i \geq 1}$, $m_i^{(a)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $p_i^{(a)}(\mathbf{m}) \geq 0$ for $a \in I, i \geq 1$, and

$$\sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{i \geq 1} i m_i^{(a)} \alpha_a = \sum_{a=1}^{n} \sum_{i \geq 1} i \nu_i^{(a)} \omega_a - \lambda \qquad \text{for } a \in I.$$

Then we have

$$W \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in P^+} M(W,\lambda)L(\lambda) \tag{2.4}$$

as $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules.

2.3. **Lattice point summation formula.** Here we give a review on an alternative formula to (2.4) when $W = \operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)}$, conjectured in [11] and proven in [4]. We can rephrase the results in the following way.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\theta \in Q$ be the highest root and $\theta = \sum_{a\in I} c_a\alpha_a$, $c_a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be its expansion with respect to the basis of simple roots. Assume that $c_a \leq 2$ for $a \in I$. Then there exist a tuple of positive integers $(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$ and that of dominant integral weights $(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$ for some finite index set J_a such that*

$$\operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in F_m^{(a)}} L(\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}) \tag{2.5}$$

where $F_m^{(a)} = \{(x_s)_{s\in J_a} | \sum_{j\in J_a} b_j x_j = m,\, x_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ and $\lambda_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{j\in J_a} x_j\lambda_j$ for each $\mathbf{x} \in F_m^{(a)}$. In each case $(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$ and $(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$ are given as follows :

Type A_r:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
a arbitrary	(1)	(ω_a)

Type B_r:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
$1 \leq a \leq r-1$ *and even*	$(1,1,\cdots,1)$	$(\omega_0,\omega_2,\cdots,\omega_a)$
$1 \leq a \leq r-1$ *and odd*	$(1,1,\cdots,1)$	$(\omega_1,\omega_3,\cdots,\omega_a)$
$a = r$ *and even*	$(2,2,\cdots,2,1)$	$(\omega_0,\omega_2,\cdots,\omega_{r-2},\omega_r)$
$a = r$ *and odd*	$(2,2,\cdots,2,1)$	$(\omega_1,\omega_3,\cdots,\omega_{r-2},\omega_r)$

Type C_r:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
$1 \leq a \leq r-1$	$(2,2,\cdots,2,1)$	$(\omega_0,\omega_1,\cdots\omega_{a-1},\omega_a)$
$a = r$	(1)	(ω_a)

Type D_r:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
$1 \leq a \leq r-2$ *and even*	$(1,1,\cdots,1)$	$(\omega_0,\omega_2,\cdots,\omega_a)$
$1 \leq a \leq r-2$ *and odd*	$(1,1,\cdots,1)$	$(\omega_1,\omega_3,\cdots,\omega_a)$
$r-1 \leq a \leq r$	(1)	(ω_a)

Type E_6:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
1	(1)	(ω_1)
2	$(1,1)$	(ω_2,ω_5)
4	$(1,1)$	(ω_1,ω_4)
5	(1)	(ω_5)
6	$(1,1)$	$(0,\omega_6)$

Type E_7:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
1	$(1,1)$	$(0,\omega_1)$
5	$(1,1,1)$	$(0,\omega_1,\omega_5)$
6	(1)	(ω_6)
7	$(1,1)$	(ω_6,ω_7)

Type E_8:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
1	$(1,1,1)$	$(0,\omega_1,\omega_7)$
7	$(1,1)$	$(0,\omega_7)$

Type F_4:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
1	$(1,1)$	$(0,\omega_1)$
4	$(2,2,1)$	$(0,\omega_1,\omega_4)$

Type G_2:

a	$(b_j)_{j\in J_a}$	$(\lambda_j)_{j\in J_a}$
1	$(1,1)$	$(0,\omega_1)$

Definition 2.5. A *rational polyhedron* $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is the set of solutions of a finite system of linear inequalities with integer coefficients :

$$P = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d | \langle \mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{x}\rangle \leq \beta_i \text{ for } i = 1, \cdots, l\}$$

where $\mathbf{b}_i \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $\beta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the dot product on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

We note that the set $F_m^{(a)}$ in Proposition 2.4 can be understood as the set of lattice points in a rational polyhedra as follows. Note that there always exists $j_0 \in J_a$ such that $b_{j_0} = 1$. Assume that $J'_a = J_a \backslash \{j_0\}$ is non-empty. Then there exists a bijection between $F_m^{(a)}$ and the set $F_m^{(a)'}$ of integer lattice points in the rational polyhedron

$$P_m^{(a)} = \{(x_s)_{s\in J'_a} | \sum_{j\in J'_a} a_j x_j \leq m,\ x_j \geq 0 \text{ for } j \in J'_a\}.$$

There are conjectural formulas for $\operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)}$ not covered by proposition 2.4 in exceptional types [11]. We will attack some of them in Section 4 as an application of our main theorem. Here we simply remark that they still allow an expression similar to (2.5). In general, it is of the form

$$\operatorname{res} W_m^{(a)} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in F_m^{(a)'}} p(\mathbf{x}) L(\lambda_{\mathbf{x}}) \tag{2.6}$$

for some *piecewise step-polynomial* p, which means $p : \mathbb{Z}^{|J'_a|} \to \mathbb{Q}$ is a collection of polyhedra Q_i in $\mathbb{R}^{|J'_a|}$ and step-polynomials $g_i : Q_i \cap \mathbb{Z}^{|J'_a|}$ such that $p(\mathbf{x}) = g_i(\mathbf{x})$ for $\mathbf{x} \in Q_i \cap \mathbb{Z}^{|J'_a|}$. A *step-polynomial* is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear combination of products of functions of the form $\lfloor l(\mathbf{x})\rfloor$ for some affine function $l : \mathbb{Z}^{|J'_a|} \to \mathbb{Q}$ with rational coefficients, i.e., $l(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{x}\rangle + \mathbf{c}$ for some $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Q}^{|J'_a|}$. We refer the reader to [24] for more detailed discussion.

The point is that we can regard $\{P_m^{(a)}\}_{m\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ as a 1-parameter family of rational polyhedra whose "combinatorial structures" do not change as m varies. This uniformity is what allows us to treat various summations over $F_m^{(a)'}$ in an m-independent

way; see Theorem 5.3 in [2] and Proposition 2.6 in [24] for example. It also leads us to expect the sequence of the characters of the RHS in (2.6) to satisfy a linear recurrence relation. Although we do not directly use any general results from [2] or [24] in this paper, they are certainly useful in getting some new perspectives on the topic.

3. Proof of the main theorem

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 3.1 we consider the cases where there exist lattice point summation formulas available. Then in Section 3.2 we consider the remaining cases.

Let us begin with some common properties of Λ_a and Λ'_a given in Appendix B.

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple Lie algebra and $a \in I$ be listed in Theorem 1.1. Let Λ_a and Λ'_a be as given in Appendix B. They satisfy the properties (ii), (iii), (iv), (v) and (vi) in Theorem 1.1.*

Proof. (ii) is true as Λ_a and Λ'_a are disjoint unions of W-orbits by definition.

(iii) follows from the facts that $\mathcal{O}(t\lambda) = \{t\mu | \mu \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda)\}$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, $\lambda \in P^+$ and that $\mathcal{O}(\lambda) \cap \mathcal{O}(\mu) = \emptyset$ for distinct $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$.

(iv) follows from a direct inspection of Λ_a.

To prove (v), we recall the fact that if μ is a weight of $L(\lambda)$, then $\lambda - \mu \geq 0$. We can check Λ_a is a subset of $\Omega(L(\omega_a))$ from the given description of $\Omega(L(\omega_a))$ in Appendix A and Λ_a in Appendix B. This implies (v).

Finally, we need to prove (vi). We note that $\omega_a \geq 0$ for each $a \in I$ as the inverse of the Cartan matrix always has positive rational entries. Now we have to check the following:

In type B_r, $2\omega_r - \lambda \geq 0$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda'_r$; it follows from $2\omega_r - \omega_{r-2} = \alpha_{r-1} + 2\alpha_r \geq 0$ and $\omega_{r-2} - \lambda \geq 0$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda'_r = \Lambda_{r-2}$, which is true from (v).

In type C_r, $2\omega_a - \lambda \geq 0$ for $\lambda \in \{\omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{a-1}\}$ for each $a \in I \backslash \{r\}$; we have $\omega_a \geq 0$ for each $a \in I$ and

$$\omega_j - \omega_{j-1} = \frac{\alpha_r}{2} + \sum_{i=j}^{r-1} \alpha_i \geq 0, \forall j \in I.$$

In type F_4, $2\omega_3 - \lambda \geq 0$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda'_3 \cap P^+ = \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2, 2\omega_1, 2\omega_4, \omega_1 + 2\omega_4\}$ and $2\omega_4 - \lambda \geq 0$ for $\lambda \in \{0, \omega_1\} = \Lambda'_4 \cap P^+ = \Lambda_1 \cap P^+$; as $\Lambda_1 \cap P^+ = \{0, \omega_1\}$ and $\Lambda_2 \cap P^+ = \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2, 2\omega_4\}$, for which we already know $\omega_a - \lambda \geq 0, \forall \lambda \in \Lambda_a$ when $a \in \{1, 2\}$ from (v), it is enough to check

$$\begin{aligned}
2\omega_3 - \omega_2 &= \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4 &&\geq 0,\\
2\omega_3 - 2\omega_1 &= 2\alpha_2 + 4\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4 &&\geq 0,\\
2\omega_3 - \omega_1 - 2\omega_4 &= \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 &&\geq 0,\\
2\omega_4 - \omega_1 &= \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_3 + 2\alpha_4 &&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In type G_2, $3\omega_2 - \lambda \geq 0$ where $\lambda \in \{0, \omega_1\} = \Lambda_1 \cap P^+$; it is enough to check $3\omega_2 - \omega_1 = \alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2 \geq 0$. □

Now it is enough to prove Theorem 1.1 (i) if we take Λ_a and Λ'_a to be as in Appendix B. Thus from now on we will focus on showing this for the rest of the section.

3.1. **Cases listed in Proposition 2.4.**

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that a tuple of positive integers $(b_j)_{j\in J}$ and that of dominant integral weights $(\lambda_j)_{j\in J}$ for some finite index set J are given. Let $F_m = \{(x_s)_{s\in J} | \sum_{j\in J} b_j x_j = m,\ x_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ and $\lambda_{\mathbf{x}} = \sum_{j\in J} x_j\lambda_j$ for each $\mathbf{x} \in F_m$. Then the sequence $\{Q_m\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ of characters defined by*

$$Q_m = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in F_m} \chi\left(L(\lambda_{\mathbf{x}})\right)$$

satisfies $\mathcal{L}[Q_m] = 0$ where

$$\mathcal{L} = \prod_{j\in J} \prod_{\lambda\in\mathcal{O}(\lambda_j)} (1 - e^{\lambda}\Delta^{b_j}).$$

Proof. From the Weyl character formula, we have

$$\left(\sum_{w\in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} w(e^{\rho})\right) \chi\left(L(\lambda_{\mathbf{x}})\right) = \sum_{w\in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} w(e^{\rho}) w(e^{\sum_{j\in J} x_j\lambda_j})$$

and thus

$$\left(\sum_{w\in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} w(e^{\rho})\right) Q_m = \sum_{w\in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} w(e^{\rho}) P_{m,w}$$

where

$$P_{m,w} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}\in F_m} e^{\sum_{j\in J} x_j w(\lambda_j)}$$

for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $w \in W$. One can easily check

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P_{m,w} t^m = \prod_{j\in J} \frac{1}{1 - e^{w(\lambda_j)} t^{b_j}}.$$

Thus

$$\left(\sum_{w\in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} w(e^{\rho})\right) \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} Q_m t^m = \sum_{w\in W} (-1)^{\ell(w)} w(e^{\rho}) \prod_{j\in J} \frac{1}{1 - e^{w(\lambda_j)} t^{b_j}}$$

and Proposition 2.1 gives the the desired conclusion. □

Now we are ready to Theorem 1.1 for the cases covered in Proposition 2.4.

Proof. Now assume that $a \in I$ is listed in Proposition 2.4. Let Λ_a and Λ'_a be as given in Appendix B. From Proposition 2.4 and 3.2, we have $\mathcal{L}_a[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$ where

$$\mathcal{L}_a = \prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda_a} (1 - e^{\lambda}\Delta) \prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda'_a} (1 - e^{\lambda}\Delta^{t_a}).$$

This proves (i). □

3.2. **The remaining cases.**

Lemma 3.3. *Let $a, b \in I$. Assume that (i) both α_a and α_b are long roots, (ii) a is the unique node adjacent to b and (iii) there exists a W-invariant set Λ_b such that $\mathcal{L}_b[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$ where*

$$\mathcal{L}_b := \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda_b} (1 - e^{\lambda} \Delta).$$

Then $\Lambda_a := \{\lambda + \mu | \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_b, \lambda \neq \mu\}$ is W-invariant and $\mathcal{L}_a[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$ where

$$\mathcal{L}_a := \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda_a} (1 - e^{\lambda} \Delta).$$

Furthermore, if there exists a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module V_b such that $\Omega(V_b) = \Lambda_b$, then $\Lambda_a = \Omega(\bigwedge^2 V_b)$.

Proof. As Λ_b is W-invariant, Λ_a is also W-invariant. From (2.2), we have

$$\left(Q_m^{(b)}\right)^2 = Q_{m+1}^{(b)} Q_{m-1}^{(b)} - Q_m^{(a)},$$

or

$$Q_m^{(a)} = \left(Q_m^{(b)}\right)^2 - Q_{m+1}^{(b)} Q_{m-1}^{(b)}.$$

Then we can apply Lemma 2.3 to conclude $\mathcal{L}_a[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$.

The last statement follows from the fact that a weight of $\bigwedge^2 V_b$ is always of the form $\lambda + \mu$ for some $\lambda, \mu \in \Omega(V_b) = \Lambda_b$, $\lambda \neq \mu$. □

For the rest of this section, we consider each exceptional type separately. When it is necessary to find the second exterior power ($\bigwedge^2 V$) or the set of weights $\Omega(V)$ for a $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module V, we may use SAGE [6] for its computation.

3.2.1. *Type E_6, E_7, E_8.* Here we consider the cases when $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type E_r, $r \in \{6, 7, 8\}$.

Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type E_6. The only remaining node to complete the proof of Theorem 1.1 is $a = 3$.

Proof. Let Λ_a be as given in Appendix B for each $a \in I$. Let us apply Lemma 3.3 for the pair $(a, b) = (3, 6)$ to prove Theorem 1.1 (i). Recall that

$$\Lambda_6 = \Omega\left(L(\omega_6)\right) = \mathcal{O}(0) \coprod \mathcal{O}(\omega_6).$$

We need to identify the set of weights of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-module $V = \bigwedge^2 \left(L(\omega_6)\right)$. As $V = L(\omega_3) \oplus L(\omega_6)$, we have $\Omega(V) \cap P^+ = \{0, \omega_3, \omega_1 + \omega_5, \omega_6\}$ from Appendix A. Thus $\Lambda_3 = \Omega(V)$, which proves (i). □

Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type E_7. Theorem 1.1 is proven for $a \in \{1, 5, 6, 7\}$ in Section 3.1. Let us consider the cases when $a \in \{2, 3\}$.

Proof. Let Λ_a be as given in Appendix B for each $a \in I$. To prove (i), we will apply Lemma 3.3 for the pairs $(a, b) = (2, 1), (3, 7)$. We first want to show that $\Lambda_a = \Omega(\bigwedge^2 \left(L(\omega_b)\right)) = \Omega(L(\omega_a))$ for each $(a, b) \in \{(2, 1), (3, 7)\}$.

Recall that

$$\Lambda_1 = \Omega\left(L(\omega_1)\right) = \mathcal{O}(0) \coprod \mathcal{O}(\omega_1)$$

and

$$\Lambda_7 = \Omega\left(L(\omega_7)\right) = \mathcal{O}(\omega_6) \coprod \mathcal{O}(\omega_7).$$

We need to find the weights of the following $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$-modules:

$$\bigwedge^2 (L(\omega_1)) = L(\omega_1) \oplus L(\omega_2)$$

and

$$\bigwedge^2 (L(\omega_7)) = L(0) \oplus L(\omega_3) \oplus L(\omega_5) \oplus L(2\omega_1) \oplus L(\omega_6 + \omega_7).$$

To this end, in addition to the decomposition of fundamental representations in Appendix A, we need

$$\Omega(L(2\omega_1)) \cap P^+ = \{0, \omega_1, 2\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_5\}$$

and

$$\Omega(L(\omega_6 + \omega_7)) \cap P^+ = \{0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_5, 2\omega_6, \omega_6, \omega_7\}.$$

Thus for each $(a, b) \in \{(2, 1), (3, 7)\}$, we have $\Lambda_a = \Omega(\bigwedge^2 (L(\omega_b))) = \Omega(L(\omega_a))$, which proves (i). □

Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type E_8. Theorem 1.1 is proven for $a \in \{1, 7\}$ in Section 3.1. We treat the cases when $a \in \{2, 6\}$.

Proof. Let Λ_a be as given in Appendix B for each $a \in I$. We will apply Lemma 3.3 for $(a, b) \in \{(2, 1), (6, 7)\}$ to show (i).

Recall that

$$\Lambda_1 = \Omega(L(\omega_1)) = \mathcal{O}(0) \coprod \mathcal{O}(\omega_1) \coprod \mathcal{O}(\omega_7)$$

and

$$\Lambda_7 = \Omega(L(\omega_7)) = \mathcal{O}(0) \coprod \mathcal{O}(\omega_7).$$

We need to compute the weights of

$$\bigwedge^2 (L(\omega_1)) = L(\omega_2) \oplus L(\omega_6) \oplus L(\omega_7) \oplus L(\omega_1 + \omega_7)$$

and

$$\bigwedge^2 (L(\omega_7)) = L(\omega_6) \oplus L(\omega_7).$$

To this end, in addition to the decomposition of fundamental representations in Appendix A, we need

$$\Omega(L(\omega_1 + \omega_7)) \cap P^+ = \{0, \omega_1, \omega_6, \omega_7, 2\omega_7, \omega_1 + \omega_7, \omega_8\}.$$

Thus for each $(a, b) \in \{(2, 1), (6, 7)\}$, we have $\Lambda_a = \Omega(\bigwedge^2 (L(\omega_b))) = \Omega(L(\omega_a))$, which proves (i). □

3.2.2. *Type F_4.* Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type F_4. Theorem 1.1 is proven for $a \in \{1, 4\}$ in Section 3.1. Now we prove it for $a \in \{2, 3\}$. As α_2 is a long root and α_3 is a short root, we treat the two cases separately.

Proof. Let Λ_a and Λ'_a be as given in Appendix B for each $a \in I$. We can apply Lemma 3.3 for the pair $(a, b) = (2, 1)$. Recall that $\Lambda_1 = \mathcal{O}(0) \coprod \mathcal{O}(\omega_1)$. As Λ_1 is

a proper subset of $\Omega(L(\omega_1))$, $\bigwedge^2 L(\omega_1)$ must be strictly bigger than $\{\lambda+\mu|\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_1,\lambda\neq\mu\}$. Thus we find it by computing directly. The elements of Λ_1 are

$$\begin{array}{llll}
\omega_1, & \omega_2-2\omega_3, & \omega_1+\omega_2-2\omega_3, & -\omega_2+2\omega_3-2\omega_4\\
-\omega_1, & 2\omega_3-\omega_2, & -\omega_1+2\omega_2-2\omega_3, & \omega_1-\omega_2+2\omega_4\\
\omega_1-\omega_2, & \omega_1-2\omega_4, & \omega_1-2\omega_2+2\omega_3, & \omega_1-2\omega_3+2\omega_4\\
2\omega_1-\omega_2, & \omega_2-2\omega_4, & -\omega_1-\omega_2+2\omega_3, & \omega_2-2\omega_3+2\omega_4\\
\omega_2-2\omega_1, & 2\omega_4-\omega_1, & -\omega_1+\omega_2-2\omega_4, & \omega_1-\omega_2+2\omega_3-2\omega_4\\
\omega_2-\omega_1, & 2\omega_4-\omega_2, & -\omega_1+2\omega_3-2\omega_4, & -\omega_1+\omega_2-2\omega_3+2\omega_4,
\end{array}$$

and 0. We can check

$$\{\lambda+\mu|\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_1,\lambda\neq\mu\}=\mathcal{O}(0)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_1)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_2)\coprod\mathcal{O}(2\omega_4)$$

in a straightforward way as it is a simple matter of finding dominant integral weights in the set. As this is the same as Λ_2, Lemma 3.3 implies (i) for $a=2$.

Now consider the case of $a=3$. For the pair $(a,b)=(4,3)$, we are not able to apply Lemma 3.3 directly as α_3 and α_4 are both short roots. But we can still proceed using Lemma 2.3 since $Q_m^{(3)}=\left(Q_m^{(4)}\right)^2-Q_{m+1}^{(4)}Q_{m-1}^{(4)}$ in (2.2) still holds.

Recall that $\Lambda_4=\mathcal{O}(\omega_4)$ and $\Lambda_4'=\mathcal{O}(0)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_1)$. We already have shown that $\mathcal{L}_4[Q_m^{(4)}]=0$ where

$$\mathcal{L}_4=\prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda_4}(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta)\prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda_4'}(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta^2).$$

From Lemma 2.3 we know that $\mathcal{L}_3'[Q_m^{(3)}]=0$ where $\mathcal{L}_3'$ is a difference operator without multiple roots and whose set of roots consists of all elements of the following forms :

$$\begin{array}{llll}
(1) & e^{\lambda+\mu}, & \lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_4, & \lambda\neq\mu\\
(2) & e^{\lambda/2+\mu/2}, & \lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_4', & \lambda\neq\mu\\
(3) & e^{\lambda+\mu/2}, & \lambda\in\Lambda_4,\mu\in\Lambda_4', &\\
(3') & -e^{\lambda+\mu/2}, & \lambda\in\Lambda_4,\mu\in\Lambda_4', &\\
(4) & -e^{\lambda/2+\mu/2}, & \lambda\in\Lambda_4',\mu\in\Lambda_4'. &
\end{array}$$

Now we check the following in a straightforward way as before :

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1&=\{\lambda+\mu|\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_4,\ \lambda\neq\mu\}=\mathcal{O}(\omega_1)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_3)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_4)\coprod\mathcal{O}(0),\\
S_2&=\{\lambda/2+\mu/2|\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_4'\,\lambda\neq\mu\}=\mathcal{O}(\omega_1/2)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_2/2)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_4)\coprod\mathcal{O}(0),\\
S_3&=\{\lambda+\mu/2|\lambda\in\Lambda_4,\mu\in\Lambda_4'\}=\mathcal{O}(\omega_1/2)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_2/2)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_4)\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_1/2+\omega_4),\\
S_4&=\{\lambda/2+\mu/2|\lambda\in\Lambda_4',\mu\in\Lambda_4'\}=S_2\coprod\mathcal{O}(\omega_1)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the set of roots of $\mathcal{L}_3'$ is the union of the sets

$$\mathcal{O}_e(\omega_3),\pm\mathcal{O}_e(\omega_1),\pm\mathcal{O}_e(\omega_4),\pm\mathcal{O}_e(0),\pm\mathcal{O}_e(\omega_1/2),\pm\mathcal{O}_e(\omega_2/2),\pm\mathcal{O}_e(\omega_1/2+\omega_4)$$

where $-\mathcal{O}_e(\lambda),\lambda\in\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ denotes the set $\{-x|x\in\mathcal{O}_e(\lambda)\}$.

Thus we find

$$\mathcal{L}_3'=\mathcal{L}_3=\prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda_3}(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta)\prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda_3'}(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta^2)$$

which proves (i) for $a=3$. □

3.2.3. *Type G_2.* Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is of type G_2. Theorem 1.1 holds for $a = 1$ as shown in Section 3.1. To treat the case when $a = 2$, we employ a different strategy from the previous section because Lemma 3.3 does not apply directly.

Let Λ_a and Λ'_a as as given in Appendix B for each $a \in I$. Let us consider a pair of sequences $\{R_m^{(1)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{R_m^{(2)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ given by

$$R_m^{(1)} = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_1} c_\lambda e^{m\lambda} \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} R_{3m}^{(2)} &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_2} c_\lambda e^{3m\lambda} &&+ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda'_2} t_{\lambda,0} e^{m\lambda}, \\ R_{3m+1}^{(2)} &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_2} c_\lambda e^{\lambda} e^{3m\lambda} &&+ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda'_2} t_{\lambda,1} e^{m\lambda}, \\ R_{3m+2}^{(2)} &= \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_2} c_\lambda e^{2\lambda} e^{3m\lambda} &&+ \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda'_2} t_{\lambda,2} e^{m\lambda} \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for some $c_\lambda \in \mathbb{C}(y_1, y_2)$, $\lambda \in \Lambda_1 \coprod \Lambda_2$ and $t_{\lambda,j} \in \mathbb{C}(y_1, y_2)$, $\lambda \in \Lambda'_2, j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Let c_λ and $t_{\lambda,j}$ be as given in Appendix C.

Lemma 3.4. *The family $\left(R_m^{(a)}\right)_{a \in I, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ satisfies the Q-system of type G_2.*

Proof. We can check the following, which is an explicit version of (2.2), in a straightforward way using computer algebra systems:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(R_m^{(1)}\right)^2 &= R_{m-1}^{(1)} R_{m+1}^{(1)} + R_{3m}^{(2)}, \\ \left(R_{3m}^{(2)}\right)^2 &= R_{3m-1}^{(2)} R_{3m+1}^{(2)} + \left(R_m^{(1)}\right)^3, \\ \left(R_{3m+1}^{(2)}\right)^2 &= R_{3m}^{(2)} R_{3m+2}^{(2)} + \left(R_m^{(1)}\right)^2 R_{m+1}^{(1)}, \\ \left(R_{3m+2}^{(2)}\right)^2 &= R_{3m+1}^{(2)} R_{3m+3}^{(2)} + R_m^{(1)} \left(R_{m+1}^{(1)}\right)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Note that any product of various $R_m^{(a)}$'s in (3.3) can be written in the form of $\sum_\alpha d_\alpha \alpha^m$ for some d_α and α in $\mathbb{C}(y_1, y_2)$. Once we write each of them in this form, verifying (3.3) is reduced to checking m-independent relations among the coefficients for each exponential term α^m, which thus requires a finite amount of computation. As the sizes of Λ_a and Λ'_a are just 6 or 7, the number of relations to be checked is reasonably small. □

Proposition 3.5. *We have $Q_m^{(a)} = R_m^{(a)}$ for each $a \in I$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*

Proof. As both $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{a \in I}$ and $\{R_m^{(a)}\}_{a \in I}$ are solutions of the Q-system of type G_2, it is enough to check the relations $Q_1^{(1)} = R_1^{(1)}$ and $Q_1^{(2)} = R_1^{(2)}$, which can be done in a straightforward way. □

Now we finish the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof. Let Λ_a and Λ'_a be as given in Appendix B for each $a \in I$. Note that we can rewrite (3.2) as

$$R^{(2)}_m = \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_2} c_\lambda e^{m\lambda} + \sum_{\substack{\lambda\in\Lambda'_2\\ j\in\{0,1,2\}}} d_{\lambda,j}(\zeta^j e^{\lambda/3})^m$$

where $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/3}$ and $(d_{\lambda,j})$ is the unique solution of the system of equations

$$t_{\lambda,k} = \sum_{j=0}^{2} d_{\lambda,j}(\zeta^j e^{\lambda/3})^k,\ \lambda \in \Lambda'_2, k \in \{0,1,2\}.$$

Thus from proposition 2.2 we have $\mathcal{L}_2[R^{(2)}_m] = 0$ where

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda_2}(1 - e^\lambda\Delta) \prod_{\lambda\in\Lambda'_2}(1 - e^\lambda\Delta^3).$$

Proposition 3.5 implies

$$\mathcal{L}_2[Q^{(2)}_m] = 0,$$

which proves (i) for $a = 2$. □

3.3. **Some remarks.** The structure of the set of roots of the difference operators in Theorem 1.1 and the Q-system (2.2) suggest the following balancing condition of roots :

Conjecture 3.6. *Assume that* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is simply-laced. We have*

$$\Omega\left(\bigwedge^2 L(\omega_a)\right) = \Omega\left(\bigotimes_{b:C_{ab}\neq 0} L(\omega_b)\right)$$

for each $a \in I$.

The method used in the proofs of Lemma 3.4 and proposition 3.5 can be applied whenever one can guess Λ_a and Λ'_a, in principle. Thus even in type E_7 or E_8 where we have some nodes for which we do not yet have a proof of Theorem 1.1, there is still possibility to carry out the same program as it is a finite problem in linear algebra. The difficult part is to come up with the coefficients c_λ such that $Q^{(a)}_m = \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_a} c_\lambda e^{m\lambda}$ for $m = 0, \cdots, |\Lambda_a| - 1$ due to the huge sizes of Λ_a and complicated expressions of $Q^{(a)}_m$ even for relatively small m. We will leave it for future work.

We finally note that Theorem 1.1 enhances our understanding of the problem of determining images of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules in the WZW fusion rings [19]. Especially, the fact that difference operators in Theorem 1.1 are without multiple roots explains the periodicity part of the problem; see Conjecture 3.10 (iv) of [19].

4. Applications

In Section 2.3, we have seen some examples where the decomposition of res $W^{(a)}_m$ is given by a lattice point summation formula (2.5). In this section, we apply Theorem 1.1 to attack the following :

Conjecture 4.1. [11] *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple Lie algebra listed below. For any $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have*

$$\text{res } W_m^{(a)} = \sum_{\substack{j_1+2j_2+j_3+j_4 \leq m \\ j_1,j_2,j_3,j_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} p(j_1,j_2,j_3,j_4) L\left(j_1\lambda_1 + j_2\lambda_2 + j_3\lambda_3 + j_4\lambda_4\right), \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$p(j_1,j_2,j_3,j_4) = \min\left(1+j_3,\, 1+m-j_1-2j_2-j_3-j_4\right)(j_4+1)$$

and

$$(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3,\lambda_4) = \begin{cases} (\omega_1+\omega_5, \omega_2+\omega_4, \omega_3, \omega_6), & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } E_6 \text{ and } a=3 \\ (\omega_5,\omega_3,\omega_2,\omega_1), & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } E_7 \text{ and } a=2 \\ (\omega_1,\omega_5,\omega_6,\omega_7), & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } E_8 \text{ and } a=6 \\ (2\omega_4, 2\omega_3, \omega_2, \omega_1), & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } F_4 \text{ and } a=2. \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

Using the same principle, we also give a new proof of the following :

Theorem 4.2. [5] *Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a simple Lie algebra of type G_2. We have*

$$\text{res } W_m^{(2)} = \sum_{\substack{j_0+3j_1+j_2=m \\ j_0,j_1,j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} p(j_0,j_1,j_2) L(j_1\omega_1 + j_2\omega_2) \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$p(j_0,j_1,j_2) = \left\{ \min\left(\left\lfloor \frac{j_0}{3} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{j_2-j_0}{3} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{j_0}{3} \right\rfloor \right) + 1 \right\} (j_1+1).$$

Remark 4.3. Theorem 4.2 is originally conjectured in the following form in [11]:

$$\text{res } W_m^{(2)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor m/3 \rfloor} \sum_{x=2k}^{m-k} \left\{ \min\left(\left\lfloor \frac{x-2k}{3} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{m+k-2x}{3} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{x-2k}{3} \right\rfloor \right) + 1 \right\} \times (k+1) L(k\omega_1 + (m-x-k)\omega_2).$$

We can easily show that this is the same as (4.3). See also [23] for a combinatorial study regarding this formula.

Let $P_m^{(a)}$ be the character of the RHS of (4.1) or (4.3), for which we want to show $Q_m^{(a)} = P_m^{(a)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. As we will see soon, we can easily find a linear recurrence relation that $\{P_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies. Then as we have found a linear recurrence relation for $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$, it is enough to construct a single linear recurrence relation satisfied by both $\{P_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ and $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ and to check the equality $Q_m^{(a)} = P_m^{(a)}$ for a finite number of m's to conclude $Q_m^{(a)} = P_m^{(a)}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

4.1. **Reduction of Conjecture 4.1 to a finite problem.**

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\{P_m\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ be the sequence defined by*

$$P_m = \sum_{\substack{j_1+2j_2+j_3+j_4 \leq m \\ j_1,j_2,j_3,j_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} \min\left(1+j_3,\, 1+m-j_1-2j_2-j_3-j_4\right)\,(j_4+1)\, x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2} x_3^{j_3} x_4^{j_4}.$$

We have

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P_m t^m = \frac{1}{(1-t)(1-tx_1)(1-t^2x_2)(1-tx_3)(1-t^2x_3)(1-tx_4)^2}.$$

Proof. We have $P_m = a_m + b_m$ where

$$a_m = \sum_{\substack{j_0+j_1+2j_2+j_3+j_4=m \\ j_0 \geq j_3 \\ j_0,j_1,j_2,j_3,j_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} (1+j_3)(1+j_4) x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2} x_3^{j_3} x_4^{j_4} \tag{4.4}$$

and

$$b_m = \sum_{\substack{j_0+j_1+2j_2+j_3+j_4=m \\ j_0 < j_3 \\ j_0,j_1,j_2,j_3,j_4 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} (1+j_0)(1+j_4) x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2} x_3^{j_3} x_4^{j_4} \tag{4.5}$$

One can verify the following without much difficulty :

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m t^m = \frac{1}{(1-t)(1-tx_1)(1-t^2x_2)(1-t^2x_3)^2(1-tx_4)^2} \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b_m t^m = \frac{x_3 t}{(1-tx_1)(1-t^2x_2)(1-tx_3)(1-t^2x_3)^2(1-tx_4)^2}. \tag{4.7}$$

By adding (4.6) and (4.7), we get the generating function of $\{P_m\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$, which finishes the proof. □

Theorem 4.5. *Conjecture 4.1 holds if (4.1) is true for $m = 0, \cdots, \ell - 1$, where*

$$\ell = \begin{cases} 6895, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } E_6 \text{ and } a = 3 \\ 27217, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } E_7 \text{ and } a = 2 \\ 143761, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } E_8 \text{ and } a = 6 \\ 553, & \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \text{ is of type } F_4 \text{ and } a = 2. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let us put $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_4$ as in (4.2) in each case. Define $P_m^{(a)}$ as the character of the RHS of (4.1) and $\mathcal{L}$ as follows :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = &\left((1-\Delta) \prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda_1)} (1-e^{\lambda}\Delta) \prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda_2)} (1-e^{\lambda}\Delta^2) \right) \\ &\times \left(\prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda_3)} (1-e^{\lambda}\Delta)(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta^2) \prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda_4)} (1-e^{\lambda}\Delta)^2 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Then Lemma 4.4 together with the same argument as in Proposition 3.2 implies $\mathcal{L}[P_m^{(a)}] = 0$ and the order of $\mathcal{L}$ is

$$\ell = 1 + |\mathcal{O}(\lambda_1)| + 2|\mathcal{O}(\lambda_2)| + 3|\mathcal{O}(\lambda_3)| + 2|\mathcal{O}(\lambda_4)|.$$

On the other hand, we have shown that Theorem 1.1 holds with Λ_a as given in Appendix B. In particular, $\{Q_m^{(a)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}_a[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$. We observe that $\mathcal{L}_a$ is a divisor of $\mathcal{L}$ as a polynomial in Δ :

$$\mathcal{L}_a = \left((1-\Delta) \prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda_1)} (1 - e^{\lambda}\Delta) \prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda_3)} (1 - e^{\lambda}\Delta) \prod_{\lambda \in \mathcal{O}(\lambda_4)} (1 - e^{\lambda}\Delta) \right),$$

which implies $\mathcal{L}[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$.

Thus if $P_m^{(a)} = Q_m^{(a)}$ for $m = 0, \cdots, \ell - 1$, then $P_m^{(a)} = Q_m^{(a)}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. $\square$

Remark 4.6. Although this certainly reduces the complete proof of Conjecture 4.1 to a finite amount of computation involving the fermionic formula, the number ℓ is rather big and thus requires non-trivial computational effort. We will report the result of verification elsewhere.

4.2. **A new proof of Theorem 4.2.**

Lemma 4.7. *Let $\{P_m\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ be the sequence given by*

$$P_m = \sum_{\substack{j_0+3j_1+j_2=m \\ j_0,j_1,j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} \left\{ \min\left(\left\lfloor \frac{j_0}{3} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{j_2 - j_0}{3} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{j_0}{3} \right\rfloor \right) + 1 \right\} (j_1+1) x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2}.$$

We have

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P_m t^m = \frac{1}{(1-t^3)\,(1-t^3x_1)^{\,2}\,(1-tx_2)\,(1-t^2x_2)}.$$

Proof. Let

$$a_m = \sum_{\substack{j_0+3j_1+j_2=m \\ j_0,j_1,j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} \left\{ \min\left(\left\lfloor \frac{j_0}{3} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{j_2 - j_0}{3} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{j_0}{3} \right\rfloor \right) + 1 \right\} x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2}.$$

We have $a_m = b_m + c_m + d_m$ where

$$b_m = \sum_{\substack{j_0+3j_1+j_2=m \\ j_0,j_1,j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} \left\lfloor \frac{j_0}{3} \right\rfloor x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2},$$

$$c_m = \sum_{\substack{j_0+3j_1+j_2=m \\ j_2 \leq j_0 \\ j_0,j_1,j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} \left\lfloor \frac{j_2 - j_0}{3} \right\rfloor x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2},$$

$$d_m = \sum_{\substack{j_0+3j_1+j_2=m \\ j_0,j_1,j_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}} x_1^{j_1} x_2^{j_2}.$$

It is easy to check

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b_m t^m = \frac{t^3}{(1-t)(1-t^3)(1-t^3x_1)(1-tx_2)},$$
$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} c_m t^m = -\frac{t}{(1-t)(1-t^3)(1-t^3x_1)(1-t^2x_2)},$$
$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} d_m t^m = \frac{1}{(1-t)(1-t^3x_1)(1-tx_2)}.$$

Therefore we get

$$A(t,x_1,x_2) = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_m t^m = \frac{1}{(1-t^3)(1-t^3x_1)(1-tx_2)(1-t^2x_2)},$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} P_m t^m &= (1+x_1\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1})A(t,x_1,x_2)\\ &= \frac{1}{(1-t^3)(1-t^3x_1)^2(1-tx_2)(1-t^2x_2)}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Let $P_m^{(2)}$ be the character of the RHS of (4.3). From Lemma 4.7 combined with the same argument as in Proposition 3.2, we have $\mathcal{L}[P_m^{(2)}] = 0$ where

$$\mathcal{L} = \left((1-\Delta^3)\prod_{\lambda\in\mathcal{O}(\omega_1)}\left(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta^3\right)^2\prod_{\lambda\in\mathcal{O}(\omega_2)}\left(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta\right)\left(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta^2\right)\right).$$

The order of $\mathcal{L}$ is $\ell = 3+6|\mathcal{O}(\omega_1)|+3|\mathcal{O}(\omega_2)| = 57$.

On the other hand, we have shown that Theorem 1.1 holds with Λ_2 and Λ_2' as given in Appendix B. In particular, $\{Q_m^{(2)}\}_{m=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies $\mathcal{L}_2[Q_m^{(2)}] = 0$, where

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = \left((1-\Delta^3)\prod_{\lambda\in\mathcal{O}(\omega_1)}\left(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta^3\right)\prod_{\lambda\in\mathcal{O}(\omega_2)}\left(1-e^{\lambda}\Delta\right)\right).$$

We observe that $\mathcal{L}_2$ is a divisor of $\mathcal{L}$ as a polynomial in Δ, which implies $\mathcal{L}[Q_m^{(a)}] = 0$ also.

Thus if $P_m^{(a)} = Q_m^{(a)}$ for $0 \le m \le \ell-1 = 56$, then $P_m^{(a)} = Q_m^{(a)}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$. Then it is not hard to check for $0 \le m \le 56$ either $P_m^{(a)} = Q_m^{(a)}$ using the fermionic formula (2.4) or $P_m^{(a)} = R_m^{(a)}$, where $R_m^{(a)}$ is given in Proposition 3.5. This finishes the proof. □

Remark 4.8. In [11], there is one more conjectural lattice point summation formula, which is for the node $a = 4$ in type E_7 and more complicated than (4.3). As we were not able to prove Theorem 1.1 for this node, we do not consider this here. We expect that formulas of the form (2.6) exist for any $\mathfrak{g}$ and $a \in I$ and we will leave the search for them in the missing cases for future work.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Masoud Kamgarpour for helpful discussions on Weyl groups. He is also grateful to Masato Okado, Travis Scrimshaw and Per Alexandersson for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Appendix A. Weights of fundamental representations

For each $\mathfrak{g}$ and $a \in I$, we will describe $\Omega(L(\omega_a))$. It is enough to give $\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+$. Note that $\lambda \in \Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+$ if and only if $\omega_a \succeq \lambda$; see, for example, Proposition 21.3 of [13]. Thus it can be easily found once we write each ω_a in terms of simple roots and we will not write down the detailed calculation for this here. For exceptional types, this also can be found by using the Freudenthal multiplicity formula [13], which is implemented in Sage [6].

For the reader's convenience we include all the nodes in type E_7 and E_8, which are not covered in Theorem 1.1 and thus have not been used in this paper; those $a \in I$ are boldface in the tables below. Note that again $\omega_0 = 0$.

Type A_r :

$$\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+ = \{\omega_a\} \text{ for any } a \in I$$

Type B_r :

$$\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+ = \begin{cases} \{\omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots, \omega_a\}, & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq r-1 \\ \{\omega_a\}, & \text{if } a = r \end{cases}$$

Type C_r :

$$\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+ = \begin{cases} \{\omega_0, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_a\} & \text{if } a \text{ is even} \\ \{\omega_1, \omega_3, \cdots, \omega_a\} & \text{if } a \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Type D_r :

$$\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+ = \begin{cases} \{\omega_0, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_a\}, & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq r-2 \text{ and } a \text{ is even} \\ \{\omega_1, \omega_3, \cdots, , \omega_a\}, & \text{if } 1 \leq a \leq r-2 \text{ and } a \text{ is odd} \\ \{\omega_a\}, & \text{if } a = r-1, r \end{cases}$$

Type E_6:

a	elements of $\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+$
1	ω_1
2	ω_2, ω_5
3	$0, \omega_3, \omega_1 + \omega_5, \omega_6$
4	ω_1, ω_4
5	ω_5
6	$0, \omega_6$

Type E_7:

a	elements of $\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+$
1	$0, \omega_1$
2	$0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_5$
3	$0, \omega_1, 2\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_5, \omega_1 + \omega_5, 2\omega_6, \omega_6 + \omega_7$
4	$\omega_4, \omega_6, \omega_1 + \omega_6, \omega_7$
5	$0, \omega_1, \omega_5$
6	ω_6
7	ω_6, ω_7

Type E_8:

a	elements of $\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+$
1	$0, \omega_1, \omega_7$
2	$0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, 2\omega_7, \omega_1+\omega_7, \omega_8$
3	see below
4	$0, \omega_1, 2\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_4, \omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_1+\omega_6, \omega_7, 2\omega_7, \omega_1+\omega_7, \omega_6+\omega_7, \omega_8, \omega_7+\omega_8$
5	$0, \omega_1, \omega_5, \omega_6, \omega_7, 2\omega_7, \omega_1+\omega_7, \omega_8$
6	$0, \omega_1, \omega_6, \omega_7$
7	$0, \omega_7$
8	$0, \omega_1, \omega_6, \omega_7, \omega_8$

The elements of $\Omega(L(\omega_3)) \cap P^+$ are

$$\begin{array}{llllllll} 0, & \omega_3, & \omega_6, & 2\omega_1, & \omega_1+\omega_6, & \omega_1+\omega_7, & \omega_5+\omega_7, & \omega_1+\omega_8, \\ \omega_1, & \omega_4, & \omega_7, & \omega_1+\omega_5, & 2\omega_7, & 2\omega_1+\omega_7, & \omega_6+\omega_7, & \omega_6+\omega_8, \\ \omega_2, & \omega_5, & \omega_8, & 2\omega_6, & 3\omega_7, & \omega_2+\omega_7, & \omega_1+2\omega_7, & \omega_7+\omega_8. \end{array}$$

Type F_4

a	elements of $\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+$
1	$0, \omega_1, \omega_4$
2	$0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3, \omega_4, 2\omega_4, \omega_1+\omega_4$
3	$0, \omega_1, \omega_3, \omega_4$
4	$0, \omega_4$

Type G_2

a	elements of $\Omega(L(\omega_a)) \cap P^+$
1	$0, \omega_1, \omega_2$
2	$0, \omega_2$

Appendix B. Description of Λ_a and Λ'_a

For each $\mathfrak{g}$ and $a \in I$, we will describe Λ_a and Λ'_a used in the proof of Theorem 1.1. As these are W-invariant subsets of P and hence disjoint unions of W-orbits, it is enough to give $\Lambda_a \cap P^+$ and $\Lambda'_a \cap P^+$. When $\Lambda'_a \cap P^+$ is not specified, it simply means $\Lambda'_a = \emptyset$. In simply-laced types, Λ_a is defined to be $\Omega(L(\omega_a))$ in Appendix A and thus we do not repeat it here. We note that this is a refined version of the tables on the orders of difference operators $\mathcal{L}_a$ given in Appendix A of [20].

Type B_r:

$$\Lambda_a \cap P^+ = \begin{cases} \{\omega_0, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_a\}, & \text{if } 1 \le a \le r-1 \text{ and } a \text{ is even} \\ \{\omega_1, \omega_3, \cdots, \omega_a\}, & \text{if } 1 \le a \le r-1 \text{ and } a \text{ is odd} \\ \{\omega_a\}, & \text{if } a = r \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Lambda'_a \cap P^+ = \begin{cases} \{\omega_0, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_{r-2}\}, & \text{if } a = r \text{ and } a \text{ is even} \\ \{\omega_1, \omega_3, \cdots, \omega_{r-2}\}, & \text{if } a = r \text{ and } a \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

Type C_r:

$$\Lambda_a \cap P^+ = \{\omega_a\} \text{ for any } a \in I$$

and

$$\Lambda'_a \cap P^+ = \{\omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{a-1}\}, \text{ if } 1 \le a \le r-1$$

Type F_4:

a	elements of $\Lambda_a \cap P^+$	elements of $\Lambda'_a \cap P^+$
1	$0, \omega_1$	$\cdot$
2	$0, \omega_1, \omega_2, 2\omega_4$	$\cdot$
3	ω_3	$0, \omega_1, 2\omega_1, \omega_2, 2\omega_4, \omega_1 + 2\omega_4$
4	ω_4	$0, \omega_1$

Type G_2:

a	elements of $\Lambda_a \cap P^+$	elements of $\Lambda'_a \cap P^+$
1	$0, \omega_1$	$\cdot$
2	ω_2	$0, \omega_1$

Appendix C. Solution of Q-system of type G_2

Here we give an explicit description of $c_\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}(y_1, y_2)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda_1 \coprod \Lambda_2$ and $t_{\lambda,j} \in \mathbb{Q}(y_1, y_2)$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda'_2, j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ used in Lemma 3.4. Recall that W acts on the field $\mathbb{Q}(y_1, y_2)$ as mentioned in Introduction. We will write only $c_0, c_{\omega_1}, c_{\omega_2}$ and $t_{0,j}, t_{\omega_1,j}$ for $j \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ explicitly below. We define all the other elements by the rule $w(c_\lambda) = c_{w(\lambda)}$ and $w(t_{\lambda,j}) = t_{w(\lambda),j}$ for $w \in W$. As each Λ_1, Λ_2 and Λ'_2 is a disjoint union of W-orbits, the following gives all the necessary information :

$$c_0 = -\frac{2y_1^3y_2^4\left(y_2^2+y_2+y_1\right)\left(y_2^2+y_1y_2+y_1\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2^3)^2(y_1^2-y_2^3)^2},$$

$$c_{\omega_1} = -\frac{y_1^5y_2^4}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)(y_2-1)(y_1-y_2^3)(y_1^2-y_2^3)},$$

$$c_{\omega_2} = \frac{y_1^4y_2^{13}}{(y_1-1)^3(y_1-y_2)(y_2-1)^2(y_1-y_2^2)(y_1-y_2^3)^3},$$

$$t_{0,0} = -\frac{2y_1^4y_2^6\left(y_2^8-y_1y_2^7-y_2^7+y_1^2y_2^6+y_1y_2^6+y_2^6+y_1^2y_2^5+y_1y_2^5-y_1^3y_2^4-6y_1^2y_2^4\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)^2(y_2-1)^2(y_1-y_2^2)^2(y_1-y_2^3)^2(y_1^2-y_2^3)^2}$$
$$-\frac{2y_1^4y_2^6\left(-y_1y_2^4+y_1^3y_2^3+y_1^2y_2^3+y_1^4y_2^2+y_1^3y_2^2+y_1^2y_2^2-y_1^4y_2-y_1^3y_2+y_1^4\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)^2(y_2-1)^2(y_1-y_2^2)^2(y_1-y_2^3)^2(y_1^2-y_2^3)^2},$$

$$t_{0,1} = -\frac{2y_1^4y_2^7\left(y_1y_2^6+y_2^6-y_1y_2^5-y_1^2y_2^4-y_1y_2^4+y_1^3y_2^3\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)^2(y_2-1)^2(y_1-y_2^2)^2(y_1-y_2^3)^2(y_1^2-y_2^3)^2}$$
$$-\frac{2y_1^4y_2^7\left(y_1y_2^3-y_1^3y_2^2-y_1^2y_2^2-y_1^3y_2+y_1^4+y_1^3\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)^2(y_2-1)^2(y_1-y_2^2)^2(y_1-y_2^3)^2(y_1^2-y_2^3)^2},$$

$$t_{0,2} = t_{0,1},$$

$$t_{\omega_1,0} = -\frac{y_1^6y_2^6\left(y_2^8+4y_1y_2^6+2y_1^2y_2^5+2y_1y_2^5+9y_1^2y_2^4+2y_1^3y_2^3+2y_1^2y_2^3+4y_1^3y_2^2+y_1^4\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)(y_2-1)(y_1-y_2^3)^3(y_1^2-y_2^3)^3},$$

$$t_{\omega_1,1} = -\frac{y_1^7y_2^7\left(2y_2^6+3y_2^5+6y_1y_2^4+y_1^2y_2^3+4y_1y_2^3+6y_1^2y_2^2+3y_1^2y_2+2y_1^3\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)(y_2-1)(y_1-y_2^3)^3(y_1^2-y_2^3)^3},$$

$$t_{\omega_1,2} = -\frac{y_1^7y_2^7\left(2y_2^6+3y_1y_2^5+6y_1y_2^4+4y_1^2y_2^3+y_1y_2^3+6y_1^2y_2^2+3y_1^3y_2+2y_1^3\right)}{(y_1-1)^2(y_1-y_2)(y_2-1)(y_1-y_2^3)^3(y_1^2-y_2^3)^3}.$$

References

[1] P. Alexandersson. Polynomials defined by tableaux and linear recurrences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.02717*, 2015.

[2] A. Barvinok and J. E. Pommersheim. An algorithmic theory of lattice points in polyhedra. In *New perspectives in algebraic combinatorics (Berkeley, CA, 1996–97)*, volume 38 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 91–147. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[3] S. Cecotti and M. Del Zotto. Y-systems, Q-systems, and 4D $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric QFT. *J. Phys. A*, 47(47):474001, 40, 2014.

[4] V. Chari. On the fermionic formula and the Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (12):629–654, 2001.

[5] V. Chari and A. Moura. Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules associated to G_2. In *Lie algebras, vertex operator algebras and their applications*, volume 442 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 41–59. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007.

[6] The Sage Developers. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 6.3)*, 2014. `http://www.sagemath.org`.

[7] P. Di Francesco and R. Kedem. Proof of the combinatorial Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (7):Art. ID rnn006, 57, 2008.

[8] P. Di Francesco and R. Kedem. Q-systems, heaps, paths and cluster positivity. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 293(3):727–802, 2010.

[9] G. Fourier and P. Littelmann. Tensor product structure of affine Demazure modules and limit constructions. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 182:171–198, 2006.

[10] G. Fourier and P. Littelmann. Weyl modules, Demazure modules, KR-modules, crystals, fusion products and limit constructions. *Adv. Math.*, 211(2):566–593, 2007.

[11] G. Hatayama, A. Kuniba, M. Okado, T. Takagi, and Y. Yamada. Remarks on fermionic formula. In *Recent developments in quantum affine algebras and related topics (Raleigh, NC, 1998)*, volume 248 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 243–291. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999.

[12] D. Hernandez. The Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture and solutions of T-systems. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 596:63–87, 2006.

[13] J. E. Humphreys. *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*, volume 9 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1978. Second printing, revised.

[14] J. E. Humphreys. *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*, volume 29 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[15] A. N. Kirillov and N. Yu. Reshetikhin. Representations of Yangians and multiplicities of occurrence of the irreducible components of the tensor product of representations of simple Lie algebras. *J. Soviet Math.*, 52(3):3156–3164, 1990.

[16] M. Kleber. Combinatorial structure of finite-dimensional representations of Yangians: the simply-laced case. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices*, (4):187–201, 1997.

[17] A. Kuniba, T. Nakanishi, and J. Suzuki. T-systems and Y-systems in integrable systems. *J. Phys. A*, 44(10):103001, 2011.

[18] A. Kuniba, M. Okado, J. Suzuki, and Y. Yamada. Difference L operators related to q-characters. *J. Phys. A*, 35(6):1415–1435, 2002.

[19] C. Lee. Positivity and periodicity of Q-systems in the WZW fusion ring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1302.1467*, 2013.

[20] C. Lee. Linear recurrence relations in Q-systems and difference L-operators. *J. Phys. A*, 48(19):195201, 2015.

[21] W. Nahm and S. Keegan. Integrable deformations of CFTs and the discrete Hirota equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0905.3776v2*, 2009.

[22] H. Nakajima. t-analogs of q-characters of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules of quantum affine algebras. *Represent. Theory*, 7:259–274 (electronic), 2003.

[23] T. Scrimshaw. A crystal to rigged configuration bijection and the filling map for type $D_4^{(3)}$. *J. Algebra*, 448:294–349, 2016.

[24] S. Verdoolaege and K. Woods. Counting with rational generating functions. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 43(2):75–91, 2008.

School of Mathematics and Physics, The University of Queensland, Brisbane QLD 4072, Australia
E-mail address: c.lee1@uq.edu.au